Originally Processed With FOIA(s): S

FOIA Number: S

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File Backup Files
Subseries: Chron File, 1989-1993

OA/ID Number: 13667
Folder ID Number: 13667-003

Folder Title:
Texas A&M 5/12/89 [OA 8489] [1]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	19	1	1

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

Doc. No. / Type	Subject/Title	Date	Restriction	Classification
01. Memo	Philip Zelikow to Brent Scowcroft, Re: President's policy toward Europe. (6 pp.)	05/16/89	(b)(1)	S

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File, Backup
Subseries:
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Texas A&M 5/12/89 [1]

Pinksheet Number: RML1442
OA/ID Number: 13667-003
Date Closed: 9/24/2004
FOIA/Sys Case #: S
Re-review Case #: 2004-2265-S
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Language on COCOM/No Exceptions for May 21 speech

In the area of trade, there remains an important barrier based on strategic considerations, popularly referred to as COCOM. When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979, the US and its allies further tightened this barrier through the "No-Exceptions" policy. Today, the Soviets have withdrawn, and we have completd our own careful review of overall developments in Soviet policy. On this basis, I wish to announce that the US will propose to its European allies and to other participants in COCOM that we should move to a policy of limited exceptions. This will permit an increase in trade in areas of technology that have no strategic value, while preserving our ability to deny the Soviets technology of real strategic importance. It is a significant step towards a more normal trading relationship, but one which takes into account the continuing Soviet drive for superiority in military technology.

Bracket if used.

DECLASSIFIED
Department of State Guidelines, July 21, 1997
By lt NARA, Date 05/20/22

~~SECRET~~

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

May 15, 1989

ARNOLD KANTER
DON SNIDER
DEANE HOFFMAN
TIMOTHY DEAL
PETER RODMAN
CONDI RICE
ADRIAN BASORA
BOB HUTCHINGS

Please provide comments/clearances by 10:30 am, Tue, May 16. Thanks.

--Philip Zelikow

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED WITH
SECRET ATTACHMENT

UNCLASSIFIED UPON
REMOVAL OF CLASSIFIED
ATTACHMENTS
9/24/04

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01. Memo	Philip Zelikow to Brent Scowcroft, Re: President's policy toward Europe. (6 pp.)	05/16/89	(b)(1)	S

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File, Backup
Subseries:
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Texas A&M 5/12/89 [1]

Date Closed:	9/24/2004	**OA/ID Number:**	13667-003
FOIA/SYS Case #:	S	**Appeal Case #:**	
Re-review Case #:	2004-2265-S	**Appeal Disposition:**	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		**Disposition Date:**	
AR Case #:		**MR Case #:**	
AR Disposition:		**MR Disposition:**	
AR Disposition Date:		**MR Disposition Date:**	

RESTRICTION CODES

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information
(b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency
(b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute
(b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information
(b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy
(b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes
(b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions
(b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells

Deed of Gift Restrictions

C(1) Closed by Executive Order 13526, governing access to national security information
C(2) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the information
C(3) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift [formerly listed as only C]
PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]

Davis

Scowcroft comments

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 9, 1989/6:30 p.m.
Version: ~~FIVE~~ SIX 7

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . . Nor is there any truth to the rumor that Reveille and Millie are first cousins.))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . . Whatever you do, whatever you become, your dreams and destiny are now in your hands.

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the names of heroes called in Muster in the foxholes of France, and on Corregidor. They are with us today in the spirit of Silver Taps. And they are all heroes . . .

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. I came of age in mid-century, when America helped to win a war and rebuild the world. I, along with your parents and grandparents, witnessed the drama of a world torn by war, then divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of external expansion, would ultimately have to face up to the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right.

(((The strategy of containment arose out of the ruins of a shattered continent, as the possibility of postwar cooperation with the Soviet Union disappeared. It was validated by the stark recognition of the threat posed by a totalitarian and expansionist state with ~~dominant~~ powerful military ~~power~~ forces.)))

Today, we ~~are entering~~ could be on the threshold of a new age because containment worked. It has been no mere propaganda victory. It worked because our democratic principles, values and institutions are sound. It worked because our alliances are ~~united~~ strong; and because the superiority of free peoples and free markets over stagnant socialism is a truth that can no longer be credibly denied.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions (((-- one of conflict and ideological conquest, and one of an international order composed of free and prosperous states.))) The wise policies of the past enable us to stand at the threshold of winning this struggle. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that we have just completed shows that we can now ~~embark on~~ pursue an agenda more ambitious than any of my predecessors might have ever dreamed in the dark days of the Berlin Blockade, the struggle against aggression in Korea, the Soviet invasions of Hungary, Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan. Forty years of perseverance has brought us a precious opportunity. ~~We can now contemplate moving beyond containment~~ Just as containment has been the doctrine of the past, changing times are allowing us to move beyond, to ~~integrate~~ the Soviet Union into the ~~world family of nations~~ international system (((as a productive~~, rather than a destructive~~, member.)))

The Soviet Union is now saying it seeks to make peace with the international order, and has criticized its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned** through the demilitarization of Soviet foreign policy, and reinforced by behavior consistent with the principles of the U.N. charter subscribed to by the Soviets in 1945, and repeatedly violated in decades since.

the doctrine of my administration -- the integration of

The Soviet Union has before signaled a desire for a more cooperative relationship, only to reverse course and return to militarism -- in the 1920s, the fifties and the seventies.

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with the practices of the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? These are hopeful -- indeed, remarkable -- signs, and let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based on realism, on deeds. Therefore, we look for nothing less than permanent changes in Soviet behavior, and the restructuring of its military forces. We look for guarantees that economic and political changes we now see will become enduring and difficult to reverse.

While ~~If~~ we hope to move beyond containment, we are now only at the beginning of the path toward the integration ~~reconciliation~~ of the Soviet Union into the family of nations ~~with the West (((, international system, a system~~ grounded in the ~~Western~~ tradition of openness, freedom and self-determination.))) Many dangers and uncertainties lie ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my

predecessors. And that is a fact of life for me . . . and for our allies.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. We will not abandon the policy of deterrence. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to defend ourselves and our allies -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . and in fact, quite the contrary.

Western policies must be designed to encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward an open society. ~~democracy~~. This task will require of us strength, patience and vision . . . vision to see what kind of world we could create, for you and your loved ones. **I see** a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. **I see** a Soviet Union that contributes to moving the Middle East toward peace, not confrontation; and pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya, like Iran -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. **I see** the Soviet Union returning the Northern Territories of Japan, ~~to undo an historic wrong~~; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony. I see an active, constructive, positive and expanding relationship.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union must follow a clear path, including:

FIRST: ~~Reduction of Soviet~~ forces. The ~~Soviets~~ possess (number) more tanks, (number) more ~~submarines~~ and (number) more ~~missiles~~ than ~~(the United States or~~ NATO). They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

SECOND: ~~Renunciation of~~ the principle that class conflict is ~~an~~ inevitable, source of international tension.

THIRD: Adherence to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to permit self-determination for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

FOURTH: ~~An authoritative renunciation of~~ the long-standing policy known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine," the ~~excuse by which the Soviets have enforced~~ their system on states struggling to be free of ~~themselves from~~ its stifling embrace.

FIFTH: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But the United States and the Soviet Union together can do more, much more, to settle disputes around the world.

SIXTH: ~~Achieve~~ a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. ~~I recognize that~~ dramatic events have already occurred in Moscow: limited, but freely contested, elections; a greater toleration of dissent; a frankness about the Stalin era. And I applaud them for that. But our hopes for a more cooperative relationship ultimately rest on democratization and ~~the~~ institutionalization of the rule of law within the Soviet Union ~~itself~~.

SEVENTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment.

As the Soviet Union creates the conditions for reconciliation, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable, stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. ~~But~~ However, arms control is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to ~~We also seek arms-control measures that are consistent with~~ our overall national security strategy.

To this end, I directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces and nuclear testing in June. I am pleased to announce that the Soviets have agreed. ~~Strategic arms~~ START negotiations will resume in Geneva the week of June, 19; nuclear testing negotiations the following week.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses should they prove feasible. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe.

(((We will not seek agreements for the sake of agreements. We will not compromise our basic principles. But if the Soviets take a constructive approach, we can move together to a safer, more stable world.)))

Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness. And make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union.

Why not let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let

openness come to mean the publication and sale of ((Darkness at Noon?)) in the Soviet Union. Let it come to mean the sale of newspapers -- like Le Monde, like The New York Times -- on newsstands in Moscow, as in every other major capital in Europe. Let the ((number)) of Soviet Jews who emigrate be followed by ((1XX,000)) more. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one more thing . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed then a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. ~~I now renew the~~ proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis,

I invite not only the Soviet Union, but also Moscow's allies in the Warsaw Pact, and our allies in the North Atlantic Alliance, to agree to open their skies and provide needed support

facilities for the frequent conduct of unarmed aerial inspection flights over their territory by planes from the other side. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details.

Such surveillance flights, in unison with satellites, would provide constant scrutiny for both sides. ~~And~~ such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the Western concept of openness -- a concept as central to Western values today as it was in President Eisenhower's time. The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal much of the Soviet commitment to a fundamentally different relationship.

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, then our economic ties will surely broaden. American investment and commerce will grow if the Soviets create a domestic environment more congenial to free enterprise.

poor phrasing

~~Until now~~, economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have ~~also~~ been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis, without subsidies. And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I

am prepared to work with Congress ~~on~~ for a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, and ~~to seek~~ the repeal of the Stevenson amendments, giving the Soviet Union Most Favored Nation status in our trade relations.

You are at the beginning of a new journey -- a journey toward a better world. The day must come when the two halves of Europe are reconciled and united, when Europeans can drive from Moscow to the Normandy coast without seeing a single guard tower, or a single strand of barbed wire. The day must come when the Berlin Wall comes down, when the voices of all Europeans can be heard in free elections. The day must come throughout the world when the first instinct is to settle regional disputes by discussion, not by violence.

(((~~Many quote~~ Winston Churchill, ~~who~~ called the Soviet Union "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." As perestroika and glasnost progress, we hope that these words will come to describe only the Soviet Union of the even more distant past. But ~~much~~ that depends on the Soviet Union and its willingness to engage our challenge. ~~This is the time to remember the rest of what~~ Churchill also said, "The key" to the Soviet Union, ~~said Churchill~~, is its "national interest." We ~~hope~~ seek to convince the leadership of the Soviet Union that it is in their national interest to ~~reconcile~~ integrate their system to the international community.)))

or ~~cut -- ((~~(I recognize the extraordinarily ambitious character of our new objective of moving beyond containment. Our challenge is unique. We must retain the strength and determination that has kept the world at peace for a near half-century. But we must also be bold and imaginative. We must balance risk and opportunity, discretion and daring. To succeed, we only need the unity of the American people, a renewed bipartisan spirit and close cooperation between allies -- in short, the courage and goodwill of free peoples.)))

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue, class of 1945 at Texas A&M ((. . . in the true Aggie spirit . . .)) was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, it is a time for peace. Once again, we extend our hand across the Elbe. We do this for you.

I am a man of this century. But the next century is yours, another American century in which you and your children can know a better world. Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 10, 1989/3:30 p.m.
Version: SEVEN

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . .))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . . Whatever you do, whatever you become, your dreams and destiny are now in your hands.

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the names of heroes called in Muster in the foxholes of France, and on Corregidor. They are with us today in the spirit of Silver Taps. And they are all heroes . . . Texas heroes.

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. I came of age in mid-century, when America helped to win a war and

rebuild a world. I, along with your parents and grandparents, witnessed the drama of postwar nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would ultimately have to face up to the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right.

Containment works. Containment works because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound. It works because our alliances are strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is a truth that can no longer be denied.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of conflict and ideological conquest, and one of the peaceful association of free states. The wise policies of the past enable us to stand at the threshold of winning this struggle. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that my Administration has just completed outlines an ambitious agenda. It is more ambitious than any my predecessors might have ever dreamt of in the dark days of the Berlin Blockade, and struggle against aggression in Korea, the Soviet invasions of

Hungary, Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan. Forty years of perseverance have brought us a precious opportunity. We can now contemplate moving beyond containment to integrate the Soviet Union into the world family of nations. Let a new era begin. Let it be an era of reconciliation . . .

But understand this -- the Soviet Union is changing its values. We are not. The Soviet Union has stood apart from -- and in opposition to -- the world. We have not. It is the Soviet Union which must reconcile itself to free values and free nations. If they do, we will welcome them with enthusiasm. In this way, the doctrine of reconciliation can succeed where the Spirit of Geneva and Detente failed.

The Soviet Union says it seeks to make peace with the world, and criticizes its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned** through the demilitarization of Soviet foreign policy, and reinforced by behavior consistent with the principles of the U.N. charter subscribed to by the Soviets in 1945, and repeatedly violated in decades since.

The Soviet Union has signaled before a desire for a more cooperative relationship, only to reverse course and return to

militarism. Soviet foreign policy has been almost seasonal -- warmth before cold, thaw before freeze.

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with the cycles of the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? Who would have imagined a Soviet leader who takes his case to the sidewalks of Moscow and Washington, D.C.? These are hopeful --indeed, remarkable -- signs. Let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika to continue and succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based on realism, on deeds. Therefore, we look for nothing less than permanent changes in Soviet behavior, and the restructuring of its military forces. We look for guarantees that economic and political changes we now see will become enduring and difficult to reverse.

While we hope to move beyond containment, we are now only at the beginning of the path toward the reconciliation of the Soviet Union with the West. Many dangers and uncertainties lie ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my predecessors. And that is a fact of life for me . . . and for our allies.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. We will not abandon the policy of deterrence. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to deter war. It is to defend ourselves and our allies, and to do something more -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . and in fact, quite the contrary.

Western policies must be designed to encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward an open society. This task will require of us strength, patience and vision . . . Let me share with you my vision. I **see** a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. I **see** a Soviet Union that contributes to moving the Middle East toward peace, not confrontation; and pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. I **see** the Soviet Union returning the Northern Territories of Japan; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony. I **see** a Soviet Union respectful of China's integrity, moving toward improved relations based on mutual respect.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union must follow a clear path, including:

FIRST: Reduce Soviet forces. Although some small steps have already been taken, the Warsaw Pact still possesses (number) more tanks, (number) more artillery and (number) more armored troop carriers in Europe than NATO. They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

SECOND: Renounce the principle that class conflict is an inevitable and permanent source of international tension.

THIRD: Adhere to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to permit self-determination for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

FOURTH: Specifically abandon the long-standing policy known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine," the enforcement by the Soviets of their system on states struggling to be free of its stifling embrace.

FIFTH: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But the United States and the Soviet Union together can do more, much more, to settle disputes around the world. I am ready to work with Mr. Gorbachev toward this end.

SIXTH: Achieve a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. Dramatic events have already occurred in Moscow: limited, but freely contested, elections; a greater toleration of dissent; a frankness about the Stalin era. And I applaud them for that. But our hopes for a more cooperative relationship ultimately rest on democratization and a commitment to human rights.

SEVENTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment.

As the Soviet Union meets the conditions for reconciliation, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable, stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. However, arms control is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to our overall national security strategy. I have directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces and nuclear testing in June. And I am pleased to announce that the Soviets have agreed.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses should when they

are ready. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe.

Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness. And make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union.

Why not let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of ((Darkness at Noon?)) in the Soviet Union. Let it come to mean the sale of newspapers -- like Le Monde, like The International Herald-Tribune -- on newsstands in Moscow, as in every other major capital in Europe. Let the ((number)) of Soviet Jews who emigrate this year be followed by any number who wish to emigrate next year. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one more thing . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed then a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. Let us again explore that proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis -- one which would include the alliances on both sides. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details.

Such surveillance flights, in unison with satellites, would provide constant scrutiny for both sides. Such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the Western concept of openness -- a concept as central to Western values today as it was in President Eisenhower's time. The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal much of the Soviet commitment to a fundamentally different relationship.

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, we will join them in broadening economic ties. But economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis.

And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I am prepared to work with Congress for a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, giving the Soviet Union Most Favored Nation tariff treatment; and also the repeal of the Stevenson amendments, which limits credit for U.S. exports and export-import credits.

((It had to happen . . . your last day in college had to end with another political science lecture . . .)) In all seriousness, the agenda I have just described has everything to do with **you**.

Today you graduate. You will start careers, you will start families. And you will become the leaders of America in the next century. What kind of world will you know? The day must come when the two halves of Europe are reconciled and united, when

Europeans can drive from Moscow to the Normandy coast without seeing a single guard tower, or a single strand of barbed wire. The day must come when the Berlin Wall comes down, when the voices of all people can be heard in free elections. The day must come throughout the world when the first instinct is to settle regional disputes by discussion, not by violence.

It is a sad fact of life that nothing forces us to recognize our common humanity more swiftly than a natural disaster. I think of Soviet Armenia, just a few months ago . . . a tragedy without blame, devastation like that of a war, but without an enemy.

My son took my 12-year-old grandson to Yerevan. At the end of a day of comforting the injured and consoling the bereaved, father and son sat down together amid the ruins and wept. How can we capture that moment? How can we convey our goodwill? How can we convince the Kremlin that they have nothing to fear from the United States?

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue (Kots-bew), class of 1945 at Texas A&M, was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, it is a time for peace. Once again, we show our goodwill. We are ready to hold out a hand to the people of the Soviet Union.

I am a man of this century. But the next century is yours, another American century in which you and your children can know a better world. Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 9, 1989/5:30 p.m.
Version: FIVE seven

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . . ~~Nor is there any truth to the rumor that Reveille and Millie are first cousins.~~))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . . Whatever you do, whatever you become, your dreams and destiny are now in your hands.

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the names of heroes called in Muster in the foxholes of France, and on Corregidor. They are with us today in the spirit of Silver Taps. And they are all heroes . . . Texas heroes,

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. I came of age in mid-century, when America helped to win a war and rebuild ~~the~~ a world. I, along with your parents and grandparents, witnessed the drama of ~~a world torn by war, then~~ POSTWAR NATIONS divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of ~~external~~ expansion, would ultimately have to face up to the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right.

~~((~~The strategy of containment arose out of the ruins of a shattered continent, as the possibility of postwar cooperation with the Soviet Union disappeared. It was validated by the stark recognition of the threat posed by a totalitarian and expansionist state with dominant military power.~~)))~~

Today, we are entering a new age because containment worked. It has been no mere propaganda victory. It worked because our democratic principles, values and institutions are sound. It worked because our alliances are united; and because the superiority of free ~~peoples~~ societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is a truth that can no longer be ~~credibly~~ denied.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions ((-- one of conflict and ideological conquest, and one of ~~an international order composed of free and prosperous~~ a peaceful association of free states.)) The wise policies of the past enable us to stand at the threshold of winning this struggle. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that ~~we have~~ my AD's has just completed ~~shows that we can now embark on~~ outlines an agenda more ambitious than any of my predecessors might have ever ~~dreamed in~~ (dreamt) the dark days of the Berlin Blockade, the struggle against aggression in Korea, AND the Soviet invasions of Hungary, Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan. Forty years of perseverance has brought us a precious opportunity. We can now contemplate moving beyond containment (DOCTRINE) to ~~integrate the Soviet Union into the world family of nations.~~ WE CAN MOVE TO A NEW ERA. LET IT BE AN ERA OF RECONCILIATION

((as a productive, rather than a destructive, member.)))

make language more dramatic

need catchy phrase

The Soviet Union is ~~now~~ saying it seeks to make peace with the international order, and ~~has~~ criticized IS its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned** through the demilitarization of Soviet foreign policy, and reinforced by behavior consistent with the principles of the U.N. charter subscribed to by the Soviets in 1945, and repeatedly violated in decades since.

~~But if [illegible]~~

We can move to

The Soviet Union has before signaled a desire for a more cooperative relationship, only to reverse course and return to militarism -- ~~in the 1920s, the fifties and the seventies.~~

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with ~~the practices of~~ the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? These are hopeful -- indeed, remarkable -- signs, and let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based on realism, on deeds. Therefore, we look for nothing less than permanent changes in Soviet behavior, and the restructuring of its military forces. We look for guarantees that economic and political changes we now see will become enduring and difficult to reverse.

If we hope to move beyond containment, we are now only at the beginning of the path toward the reconciliation of the Soviet Union with the West ~~(((, international system, a system grounded in the Western tradition of openness, freedom and self-determination.)))~~ Many dangers and uncertainties lie ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my

predecessors. And that is a fact of life for me . . . and for our allies.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. We will not abandon the policy of deterrence. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to defend ourselves and our allies -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . and in fact, quite the contrary.

Western policies must be designed to encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward democracy. This task will require of us strength, patience and vision . . . vision to see what kind of world we could create, for you and your loved ones. I see a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. I see a Soviet Union that contributes to moving the Middle East toward peace, not confrontation; and pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya, like Iran -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. I see the Soviet Union returning the Northern Territories of Japan, to undo an historic wrong; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union must follow a clear path, including:

Brent does this belong?

FIRST: Reduction of Soviet forc[illegible] sess (number) more tanks, (number) more s[illegible] ;) more missiles than (the United States or [illegible] cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to [illegible]r legitimate security needs.

armed troop cannons in Europe and th than NATO

troops let

more soldiers deployed in Eastern Europe than when Gorbachev took office

Just Marked 5697

SECOND: Renunciation of the principle that class conflict is an inevitable source of international tension.

THIRD: Adherence to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to permit self-determination for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

FOURTH: An authoritative renunciation of the long-standing policy known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine," the excuse by which the Soviets have enforced their system on states struggling to free themselves from its stifling embrace.

FIFTH: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But the United States and the Soviet Union together can do more, much more, to settle disputes around the world. ~~I~~ I am ready to work with Mr. Gorbachev towards this end.

77

SIXTH: Achieve a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. I recognize that dramatic events have occurred in Moscow: limited, but freely contested, elections; a greater toleration of dissent; a frankness about the Stalin era. And I applaud them for that. But our hopes for a more cooperative relationship ultimately rest on democratization and institutionalization of the rule of law in the Soviet Union itself.

SEVENTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment.

As the Soviet Union creates the conditions for reconciliation, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable, stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. But arms control is not an end in itself. We also seek arms-control measures that are consistent with our overall national security strategy.

To these ends?

~~To this end~~, I directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces and nuclear testing in June. I am pleased to announce that the Soviets have agreed. Strategic arms negotiations will resume in Geneva the week of June, 19; nuclear testing negotiations the following week.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses should they prove feasible. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe.

((We will not seek agreements for the sake of agreements. We will not compromise our basic principles. But if the Soviets take a constructive approach, we can move together to a safer, more stable world.)))

why brackets

Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness. And make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union.

Why not let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let

openness come to mean the publication and sale of ((Darkness at Noon?)) in the Soviet Union. Let it come to mean the sale of newspapers -- like Le Monde, like ~~The New York Times~~ -- on newsstands in Moscow, as in every other major capital in Europe. Let the ~~((number)) of~~ (number) Soviet Jews who emigrate ~~per year~~ this year be followed by ((1XX,000)) more next year. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one more thing . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed then a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. I now renew the proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis.

I invite not only the Soviet Union, but also Moscow's allies in the Warsaw Pact, and our allies in the North Atlantic Alliance, to agree to open their skies and provide needed support

facilities for the frequent conduct of unarmed aerial inspection flights over their territory by planes from the other side. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details.

Such flights, in unison with satellites, would provide constant scrutiny for both sides. And such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the Western concept of openness -- a concept as central to Western values today as it was in President Eisenhower's time. The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal much of the Soviet commitment to a fundamentally different relationship.

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, ~~then our economic ties will surely broaden. American investment and commerce will grow if the Soviets create a domestic environment more congenial to free enterprise.~~ We will join in broadening eco. ties

But

~~Until now,~~ economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have also been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis, ~~without subsidies.~~ And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I

we have just subsidized wheat sale

am prepared to work with Congress on a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, giving the S.U. Most Trade Favorite and ~~to seek the~~ repeal of the Stevenson amendments, which limit credits for U.S. exports to S.U., giving the Soviet Union Most Favored Nation status in our trade relations. (chapeau)

Today you graduate.

You are at the beginning of a new journey -- a journey toward ~~a better world~~ the next century. The day must come when the two halves of Europe are reconciled and united, when Europeans can drive from Moscow to the Normandy coast without seeing a single guard tower, or a single strand of barbed wire. The day must come when ~~the Berlin Wall comes down~~ there is no Berlin Wall, when the voices of all Europeans can be heard in free elections. The day must come throughout the world when the first instinct is to settle regional disputes by discussion, not by violence.

career family but somewhere else leadership

<YERUAN

((Many quote Winston Churchill, who called the Soviet Union "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." As perestroika and glasnost progress, we hope that these words will come to describe only the Soviet Union of the distant past. But much depends on the Soviet Union and its willingness to engage our challenge. This is the time to remember the rest of what Churchill said. "The key" to the Soviet Union, said Churchill, is its "national interest." We hope to convince the leadership of the Soviet Union that it is in their national interest to reconcile their system to the international community.))

or cut -- (((I recognize the extraordinarily ambitious character of our new objective of moving beyond containment. Our challenge is unique. We must retain the strength and determination that has kept the world at peace for a near half-century. But we must also be bold and imaginative. We must balance risk and opportunity, discretion and daring. To succeed, we only need the unity of the American people, a renewed bipartisan spirit and close cooperation between allies -- in short, the courage and goodwill of free peoples.)))

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue, class of 1945 at Texas A&M ((. . . in the true Aggie spirit . . .)) was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, it is a time for peace. Once again, we extend our hand across the Elbe. We do this for you.

I am a man of this century. But the next century is yours, another American century in which you and your children can know a better world. Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

FIRST: Reduce Soviet forces. Although some small steps have already been taken, the Warsaw Pact still possesses (number) more tanks, (number) more artillery and (number) more armored troop carriers in Europe than NATO. They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

SECOND: Renounce the principle that the Soviet Union must class conflict is an inevitable and permanent source of international tension.

THIRD: Adhere to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to permit self-determination for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

FOURTH: Specifically abandon the long-standing policy known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine," the enforcement by the Soviets of their system on states struggling to be free of its stifling embrace.

FIFTH: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But the United States and the Soviet Union together can do more, much more, to settle disputes around the world. I am ready to work with Mr. Gorbachev toward this end.

[redacted]

[redacted]

need to discuss with Brent + Dave before leaving

[redacted]

Not happy with this but some thoughts —

I think we need a Noonansm or two more.....

Pewrhaps we can salute the Soviet people a little --- klet me rampble here:

In almost every conversation I have had with high Soviet officials they mention the horrible losses they suffered in WW II ---------- million men dead, acountry invaded- but never humbled. We can identify with the fierce patriotism and pride of the Soviet people themselves.

Then not os long ago there was ~~Yerevan~~ Armenia. We saw that terrible tragedy in human terms..... My own son, went to Yerevan with our 12 year old grrandson.... and there he talked to the people and saw the kids and at the end of the long emotianlly draining day he wept. Those tears daid to the people, to the men and women and especially to the children.. we care, we care deeply... Can't we now find away given the new leadership in theKremlin to build on the good will that we feel towrad the people.Can't we conivince the new leaders that they have nothing to fear from the u.S.

I stand ready to hold out my hand, ourh ands to the people of the Soviet Union..

Tighten this improve it

welcome
Common E. house —
free to move room to room.

A+M MORE SOLDIERS

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 10, 1989/3:30 p.m.
Version: SEVEN

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . .))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . . Whatever you do, whatever you become, your dreams and destiny are now in your hands.

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the names of heroes called in Muster in the foxholes of France, and on Corregidor. They are with us today in the spirit of Silver Taps. And they are all heroes . . . Texas heroes.

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. I came of age in mid-century, when America helped to win a war and

rebuild a world. I, along with your parents and grandparents, witnessed the drama of postwar nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would ultimately have to face up to the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right.

Containment works. Containment works because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound. It works because our alliances are strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is a truth that can no longer be denied.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of conflict and ideological conquest, and one of the peaceful association of free states. The wise policies of the past enable us to stand at the threshold of winning this struggle. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that my Administration has just completed outlines an ambitious agenda. It is more ambitious than any my predecessors might have ever dreamt of in the dark days of the Berlin Blockade, and struggle against aggression in Korea, the Soviet invasions of

Hungary, Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan. Forty years of perseverance have brought us a precious opportunity. We can now contemplate moving beyond containment to integrate the Soviet Union into the world family of nations. Let a new era begin. Let it be an era of reconciliation . . .

But understand this -- the Soviet Union is changing its values. We are not. The Soviet Union has stood apart from -- and in opposition to -- the world. We have not. It is the Soviet Union which must reconcile itself to free values and free nations. If they do, we will welcome them with enthusiasm. In this way, the doctrine of reconciliation can succeed where the Spirit of Geneva and Detente failed.

The Soviet Union says it seeks to make peace with the world, and criticizes its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned** through the demilitarization of Soviet foreign policy, and reinforced by behavior consistent with the principles of the U.N. charter subscribed to by the Soviets in 1945, and repeatedly violated in decades since.

The Soviet Union has signaled before a desire for a more cooperative relationship, only to reverse course and return to

militarism. Soviet foreign policy has been almost seasonal -- warmth before cold, thaw before freeze.

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with the cycles of the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? Who would have imagined a Soviet leader who takes his case to the sidewalks of Moscow and Washington, D.C.? These are hopeful --indeed, remarkable -- signs. Let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika to continue and succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based on realism, on deeds. Therefore, we look for nothing less than permanent changes in Soviet behavior, and the restructuring of its military forces. We look for guarantees that economic and political changes we now see will become enduring and difficult to reverse.

While we hope to move beyond containment, we are now only at the beginning of the path toward the reconciliation of the Soviet Union with the West. Many dangers and uncertainties lie ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my predecessors. And that is a fact of life for me . . . and for our allies.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. We will not abandon the policy of deterrence. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to deter war. It is to defend ourselves and our allies, and to do something more -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . and in fact, quite the contrary.

Western policies must be designed to encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward an open society. This task will require of us strength, patience and vision . . . Let me share with you my vision. I **see** a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. I **see** a Soviet Union that contributes to moving the Middle East toward peace, not confrontation; and pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. I **see** the Soviet Union returning the Northern Territories of Japan; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony. I **see** a Soviet Union respectful of China's integrity, moving toward improved relations based on mutual respect.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union must follow a clear path, including:

FIRST: Reduce Soviet forces. Although some small steps have already been taken, the Warsaw Pact still possesses (number) more tanks, (number) more artillery and (number) more armored troop carriers in Europe than NATO. They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

SECOND: Renounce the principle that class conflict is an inevitable and permanent source of international tension.

THIRD: Adhere to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to permit self-determination for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

FOURTH: Specifically abandon the long-standing policy known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine," the enforcement by the Soviets of their system on states struggling to be free of its stifling embrace.

FIFTH: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But the United States and the Soviet Union together can do more, much more, to settle disputes around the world. I am ready to work with Mr. Gorbachev toward this end.

SIXTH: Achieve a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. Dramatic events have already occurred in Moscow: limited, but freely contested, elections; a greater toleration of dissent; a frankness about the Stalin era. And I applaud them for that. ~~But our hopes for a more cooperative relationship ultimately rest on democratization and a commitment to human rights.~~ Bad thing still true function human freedom. STET

SEVENTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment.

As the Soviet Union meets the conditions for reconciliation, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable, stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. However, arms control is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to our overall national security strategy. I have directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces and nuclear testing in June. And I am pleased to announce that the Soviets have agreed.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses ~~should~~ when they

are ready. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe.

Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness. And make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union.

Why not let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of ((Darkness at Noon?)) in the Soviet Union. Let it come to mean the sale of newspapers -- like Le Monde, like The International Herald-Tribune -- on newsstands in Moscow, as in every other major capital in Europe. Let the ((number)) of Soviet Jews who emigrate this year be followed by any number who wish to emigrate next year. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one more thing . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed then a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. Let us again explore that proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis -- one which would include the alliances on both sides. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details.

Such surveillance flights, in unison with satellites, would provide constant scrutiny for both sides. Such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the Western concept of openness -- a concept as central to Western values today as it was in President Eisenhower's time. The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal much of the Soviet commitment to a fundamentally different relationship.

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, we will join them in broadening economic ties. But economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis.

check

And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I am prepared to work with Congress for a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, giving the Soviet Union Most Favored Nation tariff treatment ~~and also the repeal of the Stevenson amendments, which limits credit for U.S. exports and export-import credits.~~

((It had to happen . . . your last day in college had to end with another political science lecture . . .)) In all seriousness, the agenda I have just described has everything to do with **you**.

Today you graduate. You will start careers, you will start families. And you will become the leaders of America in the next century. What kind of world will you know? The day must come when the two halves of Europe are reconciled and united, when

Europeans can drive from Moscow to the Normandy coast without seeing a single guard tower, or a single strand of barbed wire. The day must come when the Berlin Wall comes down, when the voices of all people can be heard in free elections. The day must come throughout the world when the first instinct is to settle regional disputes by discussion, not by violence.

It is a sad fact of life that nothing forces us to recognize our common humanity more swiftly than a natural disaster. I think of Soviet Armenia, just a few months ago . . . a tragedy without blame, devastation like that of a war, but without an enemy.

My son took my 12-year-old grandson to Yerevan. At the end of a day of comforting the injured and consoling the bereaved, father and son sat down together amid the ruins and wept. How can we capture that moment? How can we convey our goodwill? How can we convince the Kremlin that they have nothing to fear from the United States?

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue (Kots-bew), class of 1945 at Texas A&M, was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, it is a time for peace. Once again, we show our goodwill. We are ready to hold out a hand to the people of the Soviet Union.

I am a man of this century. But the next century is yours, another American century in which you and your children can know a better world. Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

rebuild a world. I, along with your parents and grandparents, witnessed the drama of postwar nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the ~~strategy~~ doctrine of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would ultimately have to face up to the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right.

~~Today, because~~ The doctrine of containment worked ~~we could present at the creation of a new age. This is no mere propaganda victory.~~ We ~~Containment has worked~~ It because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound. It ~~has~~ worked because our alliances are and were strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is ~~a truth that can no longer be denied~~ undeniable.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of conflict and ideological conquest, and one of the peaceful association of free states. The wise policies of the past enable us to stand at the threshold of winning this struggle. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that my Administration has just completed outlines an ambitious agenda. It is more ambitious than any my predecessors might have

?? I see a soviet union respecting China's integrity - moving towards improved relations there - but relations built on mutual respect not on the subservience of the not so distant past

Now it is time to move beyond containment — to a new doctrine — one that recognizes the changes taking place around the world and in the Soviet Union itself.

This new doctrine will hold the Soviet Union to a higher ~~and more plan~~ standard of international behavior than ever before.

This new doctrine will ~~hold~~ insist that the Soviet Union ~~to~~ keep its ~~pledges public~~ pledges to institutions of greater openness and ~~international cooperation~~ democratization.

This new doctrine will hold the Soviet Union to its commitment to ~~its military machine to~~ verifiable arms reduction.

it is the determination of the United States that
Our view, this new doctrine ~~be predicated~~ have as its ~~basis as the goal~~ ~~be made~~ ~~on the determination of the~~ United States and ~~our~~ the willingness
the reintegration of the Soviet Union ~~into~~ the community of nations.

Doctrine — to policy

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 10, 1989 6:30 p.m.
Version: EIGHT

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . .))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . .

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the heroes whose names you call in Muster. Many are those you remember in Silver Taps.

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. Parents -- we share a fervent desire for our children, and their children, to know a better world, a safer world. Students -- your parents and grandparents have lived through a world war, and helped America to rebuild the world. They witnessed the drama of

postwar nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift.

Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the doctrine of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would turn inward and address the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right. The Soviet Union is now publicly facing this hard reality.

The doctrine of containment worked. Containment worked because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound, and always have been. It worked because our alliances were and are strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is undeniable.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of conflict ~~and conquest~~, and one of ~~the peaceful association of free states~~. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that my Administration has just completed outlines a new path ~~toward resolving this~~ struggle.

Our goal is bold -- more ambitious than any of my predecessors might have thought possible. We now recognize that

forty years of perseverance have brought us a precious opportunity. Now it is time to move beyond containment, to a new doctrine -- one that recognizes the full scope of change taking place around the world, and in the Soviet Union itself.

This new doctrine will hold the Soviet Union to a higher standard of international behavior than ever before.

This new doctrine will insist that the Soviet Union live up to its pledge to make greater openness and democracy permanent.

And this new doctrine will hold the Soviet Union to its commitment to verifiable arms reduction.

If the Soviet Union meets these challenges, then we will meet a challenge of our own -- we will welcome the Soviet Union back into the world order. In sum, it is the determination of the United States that this new doctrine have as its goal the integration of the Soviet Union into the community of nations.

The Soviet Union says it seeks to make peace with the world, and criticizes its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned**.

It must be **earned** because ~~simple~~ promises are ~~no longer~~ never enough. The Soviet Union has promised ~~before~~ a more cooperative relationship, (before) only to reverse course and return to militarism. Soviet foreign policy has been almost seasonal -- warmth before cold, thaw before freeze. We seek a friendship that knows no seasons of suspicion ~~and anger~~ DISTRUST or spectre of.

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with the cycles of the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? Who would have imagined a Soviet leader who canvasses the sidewalks of Moscow and Washington, D.C.? These are hopeful -- indeed, remarkable -- signs. Let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika continue and succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based ~~on realism~~, on deeds. We look for enduring ENGRAINED economic and political changes ~~that will become difficult to reverse~~.

While we hope to move beyond containment, we are only at the beginning of our new path. Many dangers and uncertainties are ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my predecessors. That has always been a fact of life for our allies. And that is a fact of life for me.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to deter war. It is to defend ourselves and our allies, and to do something more -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . ~~and in fact, quite the contrary.~~ to convince the S.U. that reward lies in the pursuit of peace . . . underline

Western policies must ~~be designed to~~ encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward an open society. This task will test our strength. It will tax our patience. And it will require a sweeping vision . . . Let me share with you my vision. **I see** a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. **I see** a Soviet Union that pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. **I see** a Soviet Union ~~respectful of China's integrity, moving toward improved relations based on mutual respect. I see~~ which respects China's integrity, the Soviet Union and returning the Northern Territories of Japan; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union must ~~follow a clear path, including:~~ take positive steps, including;

FIRST: Reduce Soviet forces. Although some small steps have already been taken, the Warsaw Pact still possesses (number) more tanks, (number) more artillery and (number) more troops in Europe than NATO. They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

SECOND: Renounce the principle that class conflict is an inevitable and permanent source of international tension.

5

THIRD: Adhere to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to support self-determination for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe. We ask for more than the demolition of the Berlin Wall. One day it should be possible to drive from Moscow to Munich without seeing a single guard tower or a strand of barbed wire. In short, tear down the Iron Curtain.

3

FOURTH: Abandon that long-standing threat to the sovereignty of nations known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine."

3a

FIFTH: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But the United States and the Soviet Union together can do more, much more, to settle disputes around the world. But there is much more to be done around the world. We're ready. I am ready to work.

with Mr. Gorbachev toward this end. Mr. Gorbachev, let us roll up our sleeves and get to work.

SIXTH: Achieve a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. Dramatic events have already occurred in Moscow. We are impressed by limited, but freely contested, elections. We are impressed by a greater toleration of dissent. We are impressed by a new frankness about the Stalin era. But our hopes for a more cooperative relationship ultimately rest on nothing less than the democratization of the Soviet Union.

SEVENTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment.

As the Soviet Union moves toward arms reduction and reform, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable, stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. However, arms control is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to our overall national security strategy. I have directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces and nuclear testing in June. And, as you know, the Soviets have agreed.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In

the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses when they are ready. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe.

Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness. And make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union.

Why not let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of banned books and publications in the Soviet Union. Let the (number) of Soviet Jews who emigrate this year be followed by any number who wish to emigrate next year. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one more thing . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed ~~then~~ a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. Let us again explore that proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis -- one which I hope would include ~~the alliances~~ allies on both sides. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details, even separately from other arms-control negs.

Such surveillance flights, ~~in unison with~~ complating satellites, would provide ~~constant scrutiny~~ regular scrutiny for both sides. Such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the ~~Western~~ concept of openness ~~-- a concept as central to Western values today as it was in President Eisenhower's time.~~ The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal much of the Soviet commitment to ~~a fundamentally different relationship~~ improved change.

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, we will join them in broadening economic ties. But economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis.

And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I am prepared to work with Congress for a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, opening the way to extending Most Favored Nation trade status to the Soviet Union.

((After that last point, I can imagine just what you are thinking. It had to happen . . . your last day in college had to end with another political science lecture . . .)) In all seriousness, the doctrine I have just described has everything to do with **you**.

Today you graduate. You will start careers and families. And you will become the leaders of America in the next century. What kind of world will you know? Perhaps the world order of the future will be based on the simple recognition of our humanity.

It is a sad ~~fact of life~~ truth that nothing forces us to recognize our common humanity more swiftly than a natural disaster. I think of Soviet Armenia, just a few months ago . . . a tragedy without blame, warlike devastation without ~~an enemy~~ a war.

My son took our 12-year-old grandson to Yerevan. At the end of a day of comforting the injured and consoling the bereaved, father and son sat down together amid the ruins and wept. ~~How can we capture that moment?~~ How can we convey ~~our~~ goodwill? ~~How can we convince the Kremlin that they have nothing to fear from the United States?~~

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue (KOTS-bwew), class of 1945 at Texas A&M, was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, it is a time for peace. Once again, we ~~show our goodwill~~. We are ready to ~~hold out a~~ extend our hand ~~to the people of the Soviet Union~~.

I am a man of this century. But the next century is yours, another American century in which you and your children can know a better world. Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 10, 1989/10:00 p.m.
Version: NINE

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . .))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . .

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the heroes whose names you call in Muster. Many are those you remember in Silver Taps.

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. Parents -- we share a fervent desire for our children, and their children, to know a better world, a safer world. Students -- your parents and grandparents have lived through a world war, and helped America to rebuild the world. They witnessed the drama of

postwar nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift.

Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would turn inward and address the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right. The Soviet Union is now publicly facing this hard reality.

Containment worked. Containment worked because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound, and always have been. It worked because our alliances were and are strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is undeniable.

We are approaching the conclusion of an historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of tyranny and conflict, and one of democracy and freedom. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that my Administration has just completed outlines a new path toward resolving this struggle.

Our goal is bold -- more ambitious than any of my predecessors might have thought possible. We now recognize that

forty years of perseverance have brought us a precious opportunity. Now it is time to move beyond containment, to a new policy for the 1990s -- one that recognizes the full scope of change taking place around the world, and in the Soviet Union itself.

In sum, the United States is determined that this policy has as its goal the integration of the Soviet Union into the community of nations. As the Soviet Union moves toward greater openness and democratization -- ~~if~~ as they meet the challenge of responsible international behavior -- we will match their steps with steps of our own. Ultimately, our goal is to welcome the Soviet Union back into the world order.

The Soviet Union says it seeks to make peace with the world, and criticizes its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned**.

It must be **earned** because promises are never enough. The Soviet Union has promised a more cooperative relationship before, only to reverse course and return to militarism. Soviet foreign policy has been almost seasonal -- warmth before cold, thaw before freeze. We seek a friendship that knows no season of suspicion, no chill of distrust.

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with the cycles of the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? Who would have imagined a Soviet leader who canvasses the sidewalks of Moscow and Washington, D.C.? These are hopeful -- indeed, remarkable -- signs. Let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika continue and succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based on deeds. We look for **enduring, ingrained** economic and political changes.

While we hope to move beyond containment, we are only at the beginning of our new path. Many dangers and uncertainties are ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my predecessors. That has always been a fact of life for our allies. And that is a fact of life for me.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to deter war. It is to defend ourselves and our allies, and to do something more -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . **to convince the Soviet Union that reward lies in the pursuit of peace.**

Western policies must encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward an open society. This task will test our strength. It will tax our patience. And it will require a sweeping vision . . . Let me share with you my vision. **I see** a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. **I see** a Soviet Union that pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. **I see** a Soviet Union which respects China's integrity, and returns the Northern Territories of Japan; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union ~~must~~ should take positive steps, including:

FIRST: Reduce Soviet forces. Although some small steps have already been taken, the Warsaw Pact still possesses (number) more tanks, (number) more artillery and (number) more troops in Europe than NATO. They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

we refuse to talk about manpower at CFE in Vienna -- can't verify numbers, disputed even within USG

SECOND: Adhere to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- by supporting self-determination

for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, and by abandoning the Brezhnev Doctrine. One day it should be possible to drive from Moscow to Munich without seeing a single guard tower or a strand of barbed wire. **In short, tear down the Iron Curtain . . .**

THIRD: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But there is much more to be done around the world. We're ready. **Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work.**

FOURTH: Achieve a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. Dramatic events have already occurred in Moscow. We are impressed by limited, but freely contested, elections. We are impressed by a greater toleration of dissent. We are impressed by a new frankness about the Stalin era. **Mr. Gorbachev, don't stop now.**

FIFTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment. We can build a better world for our children.

As the Soviet Union moves toward arms reduction and reform, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable,

stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. However, arms control is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to the security of America, and the peace of the world. I have directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces ((and nuclear testing)) in June. And, as you know, the Soviets have agreed.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses when they are ready. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe. And, as I've said, fundamental to all of these objectives is simple openness.

Make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union. Why not, then, let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of banned books and newspapers in the Soviet Union. Let the ((number)) of Soviet Jews who emigrate this year

be followed by any number who wish to emigrate next year. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one thing more . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. Let us again explore that proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis -- one which I hope would include allies on both sides. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details, separately from other arms-control negotiations.

Such surveillance flights, complementing satellites, would provide regular scrutiny for both sides. Such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the

concept of openness. The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal their commitment to change.

Where there is cooperation, there can be a broader economic relationship. But economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis.

And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I am prepared to work with Congress for a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, opening the way to extending Most Favored Nation trade status to the Soviet Union.

((After that last point, I can just imagine what you are thinking. It had to happen . . . your last day in college had to end with another political science lecture . . .)) In all seriousness, the policy I have just described has everything to do with **you**.

Today you graduate. You will start careers and families. And you will become the leaders of America in the next century.

What kind of world will you know? Perhaps the world order of the future will truly be a family of nations.

It is a sad truth that nothing forces us to recognize our common humanity more swiftly than a natural disaster. I am thinking of Soviet Armenia, just a few months ago . . . a tragedy without blame, warlike devastation without war.

My son took our 12-year-old grandson to Yerevan. At the end of a day of comforting the injured and consoling the bereaved, father and son sat down together amid the ruins and wept. How can our two countries magnify this simple expression of caring? How can we each convey the goodwill of our people?

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue (KOTS-bwew), class of 1945 at Texas A&M, was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, we are ready to extend our a hand. Once again, we are ready for a hand in return. Once again, it is a time for peace.

Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie4
May 10, 1989/10:00 p.m.
Version: NINE

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: "BEYOND CONTAINMENT"
TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk . . .))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . .

When you look back to your days at Texas A&M, you will have a lot to be proud of -- a university that is first in baseball . . . and first in service to our nation. Many are the heroes whose names you call in Muster. Many are those you remember in Silver Taps.

We are reminded that no generation can escape history. Parents -- we share a fervent desire for our children, and their children, to know a better world, a safer world. Students -- your parents and grandparents have lived through a world war, and helped America to rebuild the world. They witnessed the drama of

postwar nations divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift.

Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn. . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansion, would turn inward and address the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right. The Soviet Union is now publicly facing this hard reality.

Containment worked. Containment worked because our democratic principles, institutions and values are sound, and always have been. It worked because our alliances were and are strong; and because the superiority of free societies and free markets over stagnant socialism is undeniable.

We are approaching the conclusion of an historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of tyranny and conflict, and one of democracy and freedom. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that my Administration has just completed outlines a new path toward resolving this struggle.

Our goal is bold -- more ambitious than any of my predecessors might have thought possible. We now recognize that

forty years of perseverance have brought us a precious opportunity. Now it is time to move beyond containment, to a new policy for the 1990s -- one that recognizes the full scope of change taking place around the world, and in the Soviet Union itself.

In sum, the United States is determined that this policy has as its goal the integration of the Soviet Union into the community of nations. As the Soviet Union moves toward greater openness and democratization -- ~~if~~ as they meet the challenge of responsible international behavior -- we will match their steps with steps of our own. Ultimately, our goal is to welcome the Soviet Union back into the world order.

The Soviet Union says it seeks to make peace with the world, and criticizes its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned**.

It must be **earned** because promises are never enough. The Soviet Union has promised a more cooperative relationship before, only to reverse course and return to militarism. Soviet foreign policy has been almost seasonal -- warmth before cold, thaw before freeze. We seek a friendship that knows no season of suspicion, no chill of distrust.

We hope perestroika is pointing the Soviet Union to a break with the cycles of the past -- a definitive break. Who would have thought we would see the deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or dissident Andrei Sakharov seated near the councils of power? Who would have imagined a Soviet leader who canvasses the sidewalks of Moscow and Washington, D.C.? These are hopeful -- indeed, remarkable -- signs. Let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika continue and succeed. But the national security of America and our allies is not predicated on hope. It must be based on deeds. We look for **enduring, ingrained** economic and political changes.

While we hope to move beyond containment, we are only at the beginning of our new path. Many dangers and uncertainties are ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has acquired awesome military capabilities. That was a fact of life for my predecessors. That has always been a fact of life for our allies. And that is a fact of life for me.

As we seek peace, we must also remain strong. The purpose of our military might is not to pressure a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to deter war. It is to defend ourselves and our allies, and to do something more -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism. . . **to convince the Soviet Union that reward lies in the pursuit of peace.**

Western policies must encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union toward an open society. This task will test our strength. It will tax our patience. And it will require a sweeping vision . . . Let me share with you my vision. I **see** a Western Hemisphere of democratic, prosperous nations, no longer threatened by a Cuba or a Nicaragua armed by Moscow. I **see** a Soviet Union that pulls away from ties to terrorist nations -- like Libya -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors. I **see** a Soviet Union which respects China's integrity, and returns the Northern Territories of Japan; a prelude to the day when all the great nations of Asia will live in harmony.

But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union ~~must~~ should take positive steps, including:

FIRST: Reduce Soviet forces. Although some small steps have already been taken, the Warsaw Pact still possesses (number) more tanks, (number) more artillery and (number) more troops in Europe than NATO. They should cut their forces to less threatening levels, in proportion to their legitimate security needs.

we refuse to talk about manpower at CFE in Vienna - can't verify numbers disputes even with USG

SECOND: Adhere to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- by supporting self-determination

for all the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, and by abandoning the Brezhnev Doctrine. One day it should be possible to drive from Moscow to Munich without seeing a single guard tower or a strand of barbed wire. **In short, tear down the Iron Curtain . . .**

THIRD: Work with the West in positive, practical -- not merely rhetorical -- steps toward diplomatic solutions to regional disputes around the world. I welcome the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Angola agreement. But there is much more to be done around the world. We're ready. **Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work.**

FOURTH: Achieve a lasting political pluralism and respect for human rights. Dramatic events have already occurred in Moscow. We are impressed by limited, but freely contested, elections. We are impressed by a greater toleration of dissent. We are impressed by a new frankness about the Stalin era. **Mr. Gorbachev, don't stop now.**

FIFTH: Join with us in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment. We can build a better world for our children.

As the Soviet Union moves toward arms reduction and reform, it will find willing partners in the West. We seek verifiable,

stabilizing arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. However, arms control is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to the security of America, and the peace of the world. I have directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces ((and nuclear testing)) in June. And, as you know, the Soviets have agreed.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses when they are ready. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a verifiable global ban on chemical weapons. We support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet offensive threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe. And, as I've said, fundamental to all of these objectives is simple openness.

Make no mistake, a new breeze is blowing across the steppes and cities of the Soviet Union. Why not, then, let this spirit of openness grow, let more barriers come down. Open emigration, open debate, open airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of banned books and newspapers in the Soviet Union. Let the ((number)) of Soviet Jews who emigrate this year

be followed by any number who wish to emigrate next year. Let openness come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one thing more . . .

Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach toward the West. He proposed a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to fly over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as President Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

President Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. Let us again explore that proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis -- one which I hope would include allies on both sides. We suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details, separately from other arms-control negotiations.

Such surveillance flights, complementing satellites, would provide regular scrutiny for both sides. Such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the

concept of openness. The very Soviet willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal their commitment to change.

Where there is cooperation, there can be a broader economic relationship. But economic relations have been stifled by Soviet internal policies. They have been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions should take place on a normal commercial basis.

And should the Soviet Union codify its emigration laws in accord with international standards and implement its new laws faithfully, I am prepared to work with Congress for a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, opening the way to extending Most Favored Nation trade status to the Soviet Union.

((After that last point, I can just imagine what you are thinking. It had to happen . . . your last day in college had to end with another political science lecture . . .)) In all seriousness, the policy I have just described has everything to do with **you**.

Today you graduate. You will start careers and families. And you will become the leaders of America in the next century.

What kind of world will you know? Perhaps the world order of the future will truly be a family of nations.

It is a sad truth that nothing forces us to recognize our common humanity more swiftly than a natural disaster. I am thinking of Soviet Armenia, just a few months ago . . . a tragedy without blame, warlike devastation without war.

My son took our 12-year-old grandson to Yerevan. At the end of a day of comforting the injured and consoling the bereaved, father and son sat down together amid the ruins and wept. How can our two countries magnify this simple expression of caring? How can we each convey the goodwill of our people?

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue (KOTS-bwew), class of 1945 at Texas A&M, was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, we are ready to extend our a hand. Once again, we are ready for a hand in return. Once again, it is a time for peace.

Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #

88.

GEORGE C. MARSHALL: The Marshall Plan

The policy known as the Truman Doctrine successfully checked the spread of Soviet expansion in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, but the future of Western Europe remained in jeopardy. The war had devastated its economy and widespread popular discontent was fomented by Communist propaganda, both from within and without. Of the four great European powers before the war, only the Soviet Union remained a power in Europe. As the economic and political situation deteriorated, the United States deemed it necessary to bolster the economic recovery of Europe in order to check the further spread of Communism. In a commencement speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, Secretary of State George C. Marshall outlined the principles of what was to become the European Recovery Program, popularly known as the Marshall Plan.

Source: *Record, App.*, 80 Cong., 1 Sess., p. A3248.

I NEED NOT TELL YOU gentlemen that the world situation is very serious. That must be apparent to all intelligent people. I think one difficulty is that the problem is one of such enormous complexity that the very mass of facts presented to the public by press and radio make it exceedingly difficult for the man in the street to reach a clear appraisement of the situation. Furthermore, the people of this country are distant from the troubled areas of the earth and it is hard for them to comprehend the plight and consequent reactions of the long-suffering peoples, and the effect of those reactions on their governments in connection with our efforts to promote peace in the world.

In considering the requirements for the rehabilitation of Europe, the physical loss of life, the visible destruction of cities, factories, mines, and railroads was correctly estimated; but it has become obvious during recent months that this visible destruction was probably less serious than the dislocation of the entire fabric of European economy. For the past ten years conditions have been highly abnormal. The feverish preparation for war and the more feverish maintenance of the war effort engulfed all aspects of national economies. Machinery has fallen into disrepair or is entirely obsolete. Under the arbitrary and destructive Nazi rule, virtually every possible enterprise was geared into the German war machine. Long-standing commercial ties, private institutions, banks, insurance companies, and shipping companies disappeared through loss of capital, absorption through nationalization, or by simple destruction. In many countries, confidence in the local currency has been severely shaken.

The breakdown of the business structure of Europe during the war was complete. Recovery has been seriously retarded by the fact that two years after the close of hostilities a peace settlement with Germany and Austria has not been agreed upon. But even given a more prompt solution of these diffi-

cult problems, the rehabilitatio
nomic structure of Europe qu
will require a much longer tim
effort than had been foreseen.

There is a phase of this ma
both interesting and serious. Tl
always produced the foodstuffs
with the city dweller for the
ties of life. This division of labo
of modern civilization. At the
it is threatened with breakdow
and city industries are not pr
quate goods to exchange wi
producing farmer. Raw mate
are in short supply. Machinery
worn out. The farmer or the p
find the goods for sale which
purchase. So the sale of his
for money which he cannot
him an unprofitable transactio
fore, has withdrawn many fie
cultivation and is using them
He feeds more grain to stock
himself and his family an am
food, however short he may b
and the other ordinary gadge
tion.

Meanwhile people in the c
of food and fuel. So the go
forced to use their foreign mo
ey to procure these necessities
process exhausts funds which
needed for reconstruction. Th
ous situation is rapidly deve
bodes no good for the world.
system of the division of labo
the exchange of products is ba
ger of breaking down.

The truth of the matter is
requirements for the next
years of foreign food and c
products — principally from
are so much greater than her
to pay that she must have su
tional help or face economic,
litical deterioration of a very
ter.

cult problems, the rehabilitation of the economic structure of Europe quite evidently will require a much longer time and greater effort than had been foreseen.

There is a phase of this matter which is both interesting and serious. The farmer has always produced the foodstuffs to exchange with the city dweller for the other necessities of life. This division of labor is the basis of modern civilization. At the present time it is threatened with breakdown. The town and city industries are not producing adequate goods to exchange with the food-producing farmer. Raw materials and fuel are in short supply. Machinery is lacking or worn out. The farmer or the peasant cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase. So the sale of his farm produce for money which he cannot use seems to him an unprofitable transaction. He, therefore, has withdrawn many fields from crop cultivation and is using them for grazing. He feeds more grain to stock and finds for himself and his family an ample supply of food, however short he may be on clothing and the other ordinary gadgets of civilization.

Meanwhile people in the cities are short of food and fuel. So the governments are forced to use their foreign money and credits to procure these necessities abroad. This process exhausts funds which are urgently needed for reconstruction. Thus a very serious situation is rapidly developing which bodes no good for the world. The modern system of the division of labor upon which the exchange of products is based is in danger of breaking down.

The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements for the next three or four years of foreign food and other essential products — principally from America — are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character.

The remedy lies in breaking the vicious circle and restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole. The manufacturer and the farmer throughout wide areas must be able and willing to exchange their products for currencies the continuing value of which is not open to question.

Aside from the demoralizing effect on the world at large and the possibilities of disturbances arising as a result of the desperation of the people concerned, the consequences to the economy of the United States should be apparent to all. It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist.

Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative. Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States government. Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us. Furthermore, governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States.

It is already evident that, before the United States government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the European world

on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this government. It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number [of], if not all, European nations.

An essential part of any successful action on the part of the United States is an understanding on the part of the people of America of the character of the problem and the remedies to be applied. Political passion and prejudice should have no part. With foresight, and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome.

89.

George F. Kennan: Sources of Soviet Conduct

The forward thrust of Soviet power in the immediate postwar period led to a shift in American foreign policy from one of promoting cooperation with Soviet Russia to one of "containment" of Soviet Communist expansion. The "containment" policy was first formulated by George F. Kennan, counselor of the American Embassy in Moscow in 1945 and later director of the Policy Planning Committee of the State Department. The Truman Doctrine was the first public expression of the "containment" policy, a position that shortly after was elaborated and defined in an unsigned article in Foreign Affairs. *It was soon learned that the article had been written by Kennan, and it attracted widespread attention as a more or less official statement of American policy toward the Soviet Union. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct" is reprinted here in part.*

Source: Reprinted by special permission from *Foreign Affairs*, July 1947. Copyright by the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York.

The political personality of Soviet power as we know it today is the product of ideology and circumstances: ideology inherited by the present Soviet leaders from the movement in which they had their political origin, and circumstances of the power which they now have exercised for nearly three decades in Russia. There can be few tasks of psychological analysis more difficult than to try to trace the interaction of these two forces and the relative role of each in the determination of official Soviet conduct. Yet the attempt must be made if that conduct is to be understood and effectively countered.

It is difficult to summarize the set of ideological concepts with which the Soviet leaders came into power. Marxian ideology, in its Russian-Communist projection, has always been in process of subtle evolution.

The materials on which it bas
extensive and complex. But the
features of Communist thought
in 1916 may perhaps be summa
lows: *(a)* that the central facto
of man, the factor which det
character of public life and the
my of society," is the system by
erial goods are produced and
(b) that the capitalist system of
s a nefarious one which inevita
the exploitation of the working
capital-owning class and is inca
veloping adequately the econom
of society or of distributing fairl
rial goods produced by huma
that capitalism contains the seed
destruction and must, in view o
ty of the capital-owning class to
to economic change, result ev
inescapably in a revolutionary
power to the working class; a
imperialism, the final phase of
leads directly to war and revolu

Now it lies in the nature of
world of the Soviet leaders, as
the character of their ideology,
position to them can be officiall
as having any merit or justificat
ever. Such opposition can flow
only from the hostile and incorr
of dying capitalism. As long as
capitalism were officially rec
existing in Russia, it was possi
on them, as an internal element
blame for the maintenance of
form of society. But as these re
liquidated, little by little, this
fell away; and when it was in
cially that they had been finall
it disappeared altogether. And
ated one of the most basic of
sions which came to act upon
regime: since capitalism no long
Russia and since it could not
that there could be serious or
opposition to the Kremlin sprin

E173
.A5
v.16
WHRC

THE ANNALS OF AMERICA

Volume 16

1940 - 1949

The Second World War and After



William Benton, *Publisher*

ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, INC.

Chicago London Toronto Geneva Sydney Tokyo Manila

Protest underlines

We're going to stay in Europe as long as there is a threat.

Sad if we haven't settled it. Democracies dispute on line in SOU. nations, not.

MARK'S COPY

B.U.

NSC draft: 4/10/89

Western Europe Speech

When Harry Truman spoke at the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty on April 4, 1949, he explained its goal in his typical down-to-earth way:

> "In this pact, we hope to create a shield against aggression and the fear of aggression -- a bulwark which will permit us to get on with the real business of government and society, the business of achieving a fuller and happier life for all our citizens."

And what a success it's been! Behind the shield of our collective defense, Europe revived and the free nations prospered. (Aggression was deterred;) the world was made safer. Our adversaries now talk seriously of peace. Has any alliance in history ensured the freedom and prosperity of so many nations with such success, and for so long?

Athens-Sparta

The Challenge

Throughout those four decades, there were those who warned of problems in the Alliance. The prophecies of doom were wrong. Yet, problems there have been -- and problems there are today. We do ourselves no favor by ignoring them. In the coming years, the Atlantic Alliance will be tested as never before:

-- Many perceive the threat from our adversaries as diminishing, which diminishes the political will in our countries to maintain or modernize our defenses.

-- America's pursuit of nuclear arms reduction with the Soviet Union has sometimes unnerved our allies, who -- while they are eager for arms reduction -- also fear the erosion of our nuclear guarantee and chafe at the dependency that leaves their destiny so much in the hands of others.

-- As all our governments wrestle with economic challenges, there are tough disputes over trade and the equitable sharing of the common defense.

These challenges must be mastered. But if we master them, history offers us a unique chance to shape the future. For a new era of change is also testing our adversaries, and finding them wanting. Their system is in profound crisis:

-- In Eastern Europe, a powerful yearning for self-determination is asserting itself, which will not be satisfied by mere easing of the grip of illegitimate regimes.

-- In the Soviet Union, we see an extraordinary experiment in reform, bringing many welcome changes. Whatever the future extent -- or durability -- of this experiment, it already amounts to a dramatic confession of failure.

Perhaps we will see, down the road, a real end to the cruel division of Europe imposed by Soviet power. Perhaps we will see, down the road, a real end to the Soviet military threat to the West. That is our vision -- a Europe of security and freedom for all, East and West.

Today, it's the democracies that are vibrant, as we advance full-steam-ahead into the Information Revolution of supercomputers and telecommunications, transforming the technological base of world prosperity. It's no accident that this new burst of innovation came from the creativity of the free nations. And democracy is spreading around the world. The cause of human rights can't be suppressed. Our principles of economic freedom are being vindicated everywhere -- even in Communist countries. And the connection between political freedom and economic progress -- that lesson, too, is finally appreciated as never before.

About nine years from now, the Communist Manifesto will be 150 years old. That document preached a new social and economic system, and promised that capitalism would end up on the trash

heap of history. Yet today, it is Marxism that is everywhere discredited...despised...discarded.

My Commitment

As the democracies enter a new era of testing and of hope, let me declare America's commitment to its allies:

-- First, our major alliances in the Atlantic and the Pacific remain the cornerstones of our foreign policy. What was a bold innovation in 1949 is now a permanent fact, sustained by both moral principle and vital interest. This is a pledge backed by both American political parties, by the President and Congress united, and by our people.

-- Second, America remains committed to the defense of Europe by whatever means may be necessary, in accordance with the agreed Alliance strategy. Our nuclear forces remain the ultimate deterrent of aggression -- and there is no substitute. That's why modernization is so important. The most basic asymmetry in the European balance is geography -- the inescapable preponderance of Soviet power. The American nuclear guarantee is the equally inescapable counterweight.

-- Third, we remain equally committed to contribute to the conventional defense of Europe -- subject to our very real

hope to reach a more secure balance, at lower levels, through negotiations. I will strongly oppose legislative attempts to withdraw U.S. troops from Europe unilaterally. Moscow will still command a standing army of four and a half million men -- after the cutbacks announced by Mr. Gorbachev in December. We are prepared to maintain U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as a Soviet military threat to the continent exists.

-- Fourth, we will pursue better relations with our adversaries in every area, and on a broad agenda of arms reductions -- strategic nuclear, conventional, chemical. NATO's success over 40 years has brought us to an extraordinary moment of opportunity in East-West relations. We will seize that opportunity -- in constant consultation with our allies, sensitive to their vital interests and concerns. There will be no surprises for our allies on such important matters.

Iceland / Reykjavik - Ask Blackwill: too strong

-- Fifth, the United States continues, as it has for the entire postwar period, to endorse and support European integration as one of the historic developments of our time. We welcome a larger European role in the world. We welcome the political role of the European Community, and we are eager, if the EC agrees, to develop and intensify the mechanisms of our consultation and cooperation on world issues.

hope to reach a more secure balance, at lower levels, through negotiations. I will strongly oppose legislative attempts to withdraw U.S. troops from Europe unilaterally. Moscow will still command a standing army of four and a half million men -- after the cutbacks announced by Mr. Gorbachev in December. We are prepared to maintain U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as a Soviet military threat to the continent exists.

-- Fourth, we will pursue better relations with our adversaries in every area, and on a broad agenda of arms reductions -- strategic nuclear, conventional, chemical. NATO's success over 40 years has brought us to an extraordinary moment of opportunity in East-West relations. We will seize that opportunity -- in constant consultation with our allies, sensitive to their vital interests and concerns. There will be no surprises for our allies on such important matters.

-- Fifth, the United States continues, as it has for the entire postwar period, to endorse and support European integration as one of the historic developments of our time. We welcome a larger European role in the world. We welcome the political role of the European Community, and we are eager, if the EC agrees, to develop and intensify the mechanisms of our consultation and cooperation on world issues.

The Threshold of the Next Century

I make these pledges because there is no doubt in my mind that America's goals for a new century of peace cannot be achieved except in partnership with our fellow democracies. If we have the wisdom to maintain the strength and unity that have brought us to this hopeful point, the future holds tremendous promise.

Look at Europe. Look at the breathtaking advance in European integration scheduled for 1992 -- a single European market.

European unity and NATO partnership are not in conflict; they reinforce each other. The founders of the Alliance in 1949 saw it as one of their principal aims to ensure a climate of security so that European integration -- which had already begun -- could proceed. European unification has meant the ending of hatreds, the fostering of democracy, the economic and social regeneration of a continent, and the strengthening of the West.

Nineteen-ninety-two will mean a new resurgence of the vast genius and potential of Europe. In today's new era of technology, it means Europe's opportunity to remain in the first rank. In an era of new hope for an end to Europe's divisions, resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet, drawing the economically and politically impoverished countries of Eastern Europe westward, toward our way of life. In today's new era of political change

The Threshold of the Next Century

I make these pledges because there is no doubt in my mind that America's goals for a new century of peace cannot be achieved except in partnership with our fellow democracies. If we have the wisdom to maintain the strength and unity that have brought us to this hopeful point, the future holds tremendous promise.

Look at Europe. Look at the breathtaking advance in European integration scheduled for 1992 -- a single European market.

European unity and NATO partnership are not in conflict; they reinforce each other. The founders of the Alliance in 1949 saw it as one of their principal aims to ensure a climate of security so that European integration -- which had already begun -- could proceed. European unification has meant the ending of hatreds, the fostering of democracy, the economic and social regeneration of a continent, and the strengthening of the West.

Nineteen-ninety-two will mean a new resurgence of the vast genius and potential of Europe. In today's new era of technology, it means Europe's opportunity to remain in the first rank. In an era of new hope for an end to Europe's divisions, resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet, drawing the economically and politically impoverished countries of Eastern Europe westward, toward our way of life. In today's new era of political change

sweeping across the continent, the strategic importance of what is happening on the Western side of the line cannot be overestimated.

There will be problems in Atlantic relations, but these problems are soluble. The United States and other nations will fight hard against protectionism and unfair barriers that deny access -- you can be sure of that. We want to see what President Kennedy used to call an "outward-looking" Europe, a European Community that uses its new strength to contribute to a global expansion of trade, not to constrict it. We need to create with our European friends specific new mechanisms to manage the transition to 1992 cooperatively.

In the security dimension, the dividend can be just as great. European defense coordination can mark a new stage of Atlantic relations. In the coming new era, the West needs a stronger "European pillar," in the framework of the Alliance. We support the historic endeavors of defense cooperation between France and Germany. We support the British and French independent nuclear deterrents and their modernization, cooperation between those two countries, and their special role in European security; we will make no agreements with the Soviet Union that compromise those forces. We value the contribution of the Eurogroup in NATO's councils. We applaud the revitalized Western European Union and its landmark "Platform" of October 1987, which expressed Europe's

own identity and interests but in partnership with the United States. We welcomed the WEU's coordination of European efforts to help protect the Persian Gulf.

I do not fear European defense cooperation. Granted, part of its motivation is to be a little more independent of us. But Europeans should see defense as an enterprise they engage in for their own future, not as a favor to the United States. And our security interests are parallel, indeed indivisible; no advocate of this European coordination conceives of a plausible defense of Europe without the continuing partnership with the United States.

Such efforts, which can increase the effectiveness of Europe's role in Western defense, should also be taken account of in any measurement of how burdens are being shared.

Conclusion

Nineteen-ninety-two, of course, will be a notable date for another reason -- commemorating the discovery of the New World. We have five centuries to celebrate, not just four decades.

We all know Canning's words about the New World called into existence to redress the balance of the Old. Twice in this century, the New World came to the rescue of the civilization

that gave birth to us. And we Americans, with our great and growing cultural diversity, like to think that we have enriched that common heritage.

How fitting it is that Europe's own resurgence will mark the next advance of that civilization! The North Atlantic Treaty expressed the will of its members, and I quote: "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law." Those are values that Europe gave to all of us, and nurtured over its long history. The modern vitality of Europe -- its prosperity, its freedom, and its unity -- is the vindication and culmination of everything we cherish.

They are universal values -- whether expressed in the American Bill of Rights, or the French Rights of Man, or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or in the power of the idea of democracy as we see today on every continent. America -- and the world -- owe a moral debt to Europe that is beyond measure.

Today's challenges to the West are without precedent. There are dangers -- most of all if we fail to stand together. But our success for 40 years points the way to the future.

Harry Truman, on that memorable occasion, put it this way:

"We do not believe that there are blind tides of history which sweep men one way or another. In our own time we have seen brave men overcome obstacles that seemed insurmountable and forces that seemed overwhelming. Men with courage and vision can still determine their own destiny. They can choose slavery or freedom -- war or peace. ... If there is anything certain today, if there is anything inevitable in the future, it is the will of the people of the world for freedom and for peace."

How right he was!

West B.B. 4/7/89

16-17 min.
20 min.

NEW Bush approach
- Put memo to rest
- Pres. Mitt. sitting next to him / U.S.-France

Leave Open Skies open

Mulroney's idea: NATO - Warsaw Pact. Do many problems.

Open Skies
Two versions, IKE
(1) Soviets rejected in 1950's
$1 billion — Sov. - U.S. planes to fly around country - transparency - 007

Bureaucracy hates
(1) old
(2) too many planes
(3) sabotage to do it

YR 2000 Nine all across Europe - 10 guns
Germany reunification — just "self-determination"

Old North Church (617) 523-6676
Salem Street
not cobbled

Nato 16 members
Canada US Belgium
Denmark France W. Germany
Greece Iceland Italy
Luxembourg Norway Netherlands
Portugal Spain United Kingdom
Turkey

Sec. of State George C. Marshall
almost 42 yrs. ago (6-5-47)

South Boston — Southie
Dorchester
Charlestown

Bll Terriers

TRANSFER SHEET
BUSH PRESIDENTIAL MATERIALS PROJECT

COLLECTION Bush Presidential Records--
Office of Speechwriting--
Speech File - Backup

ACC.NO: 93-01

The following material was withdrawn from this segment of the collection and trasferred to the _____AUDIOVISUAL COLLECTION
_____BOOK COLLECTION _____MUSEUM COLLECTION
OTHER (SPECIFY: computer_____)

DESCRIPTION: one computer diskette

SERIES Office of Speechwriting Speech File - Backup	BOX NO. 13
FILE FOLDER TITLE: Texas A & M [1] 5/12/89 [OA 8489]	
TRANSFERRED BY: JGP	DATE OF TRANSFER: 6/10/96
RECEIVED BY:	DATE RECEIVED 6/10/96

MASTER

"Beyond Containment"

Davis/Martin/Rice
Title: Aggie2
May 7, 1989
Version: Four

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TEXAS A&M COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1989/2 p.m.

Thank you. I am delighted to be back in College Station, among my fellow Texans and friends. ((And for those of you who are Democrats, there is no truth to the rumor that Phil Gramm and I are ready to take our Elephant Walk.))

My sincerest congratulations go to every graduate, and to your parents. In this ceremony, we celebrate nothing less than the commencement of the rest, and the best, of your life . . .

I remember when I graduated, in 1948, thrilled to be striking out on my own, driving my red Studebaker across the prairie roads. I didn't know exactly what I was looking for in Texas. But I did know one thing -- whatever I would do, whatever I would become, destiny was in **my** hands. Your dreams, your destiny, are now in **your** hands.

But dreams are hard won, and no generation can escape history. I came of age in mid-century, when America helped to win a war and rebuild the world. I, along with your parents and grandparents, witnessed the drama of a world torn by war, then

divided by Soviet subversion and force, but sustained by an Allied response most vividly seen in the Berlin Airlift. Wise men . . . Truman and Eisenhower, Vandenberg and Rayburn . . . Marshall, Acheson and Kennan, crafted the strategy of containment. They believed that the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of external expansion, would ultimately have to face up to the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhumane system. And they were right.

The strategy of containment arose out of the ruins of a shattered continent, as the possibility of postwar cooperation with the Soviet Union disappeared. It was validated by the stark recognition of the threat posed by a totalitarian and expansionist state with dominant military power.

Today, we are entering a new age because containment worked. It has been no mere propaganda victory. It worked because our democratic principles, values and institutions are sound. It worked because our alliances are united; and because the superiority of free peoples and free markets over stagnant socialism is a truth that can no longer be credibly denied.

We approach the conclusion of a historic postwar struggle between two visions -- one of conflict and ideological conquest, and one of an international order composed of free and prosperous states. The wise policies of the past enable us to stand at the

threshold of winning this struggle. The review of U.S.-Soviet relations that we have just completed shows that we can now embark on an agenda more ambitious than any of my predecessors might have ever dreamed in the dark days of the Berlin Blockade, the struggle against aggression in Korea, and the Soviet invasions of Hungary, Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan. Forty years of perseverance has brought us a precious opportunity. We can now move beyond containment to an era of integrating the S.U. into the world family of nations, as a productive, responsible member.

The Soviet Union has said it seeks rapprochement with the international order, and has criticized its own postwar policies. These are words we can only applaud. But a new relationship can not be simply declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be **earned** through the demilitarization of Soviet foreign policy and reinforced by behavior consistent with the principles of the U.N. charter to which the Soviets subscribed in 1945, and have repeatedly violated.

Many times before, the Soviet Union has signaled a desire for a more cooperative relationship, only to reverse course and return to militarism in the 1920s, the fifties and the seventies.

We hope perestroika is leading the Soviet Union to a break with the practices of the past -- an enduring break. Who would have thought we would see the internal deliberations of the Central Committee on the front page of Pravda, or Andrei Sakharov

seated near the councils of power? These are hopeful signs, and let no one doubt our sincere desire to see perestroika succeed. But our national security is not predicated on hope. It must be based on deeds. Therefore, we seek nothing less than the fundamental restructuring of Soviet behavior, institutions and military forces.

If we are moving beyond containment, we are only at the beginning of the path toward the reconciliation of the Soviet Union with the international system. Many dangers and uncertainties lie ahead. We must not forget that the Soviet Union has been acquiring awesome military capabilities which support a foreign policy hostile to the West. That was a fact of life for my predecessors. And that is a fact of life for me.

As we seek peace, we must remain strong in a perilous world. We will not abandon a philosophy of peace through strength. The purpose of our military might is not to put pressure on a weak Soviet economy, or to seek military superiority. It is to defend ourselves, and to do something more -- to convince the Soviet Union that there can be no reward in pursuing expansionism . . . and in fact, quite the contrary.

Western policies must be designed to encourage the evolution of the Soviet Union from a source of instability to a productive member of the family of nations. This task will require of us

patience, ~~creativity~~ and vision . . . vision to see what kind of world we could create, for you and your loved ones. ~~I see a Europe, long divided and scarred by two world wars, at last healed -- where Eastern Europe, prosperous and free, is reconciled with its Western neighbors.~~ ~~I see~~ a Soviet Union that ~~abandons terrorist nations -- like Libya -- that threaten the legitimate security of their neighbors; a Soviet Union that joins with those that seek to live in peace.~~ **I see** the great nations of Asia living in harmony -- when the Soviet Union has returned the Northern Territories of Japan, to undo an historic wrong.

~~In short, I see a world in which the Soviet Union is finally integrated as a productive member of the international community of states.~~ But to fulfill this vision, the Soviet Union ~~must~~ follow a clear path, including:

*** Reduction of Soviet forces to ~~smaller~~ and less threatening levels, until they are in proportion to ~~their~~ legitimate security needs.

*** Renunciation of the principle that class conflict is an inevitable source of international tension.

*** Adherence to the Soviet obligation -- promised in the final days of World War Two -- to permit self-determination for the nations of East-Central Europe.

Fourth

*** An authoritative renunciation of the long-standing policy known as "The Brezhnev Doctrine," the excuse by which the Soviets have ~~toppled governments, and cast a chilling shadow over Eastern Europe.~~ enforced their system on states struggling to free themselves from its stifling embrace.

Fifth

*** Joining the West ~~in sincerely and objectively seeking settlements of~~ in positive, practical --- not merely rhetorical --- efforts to find diplo. solutions to regional disputes around the world. The Soviet Union should cease to undermine regional stability ~~and join us in positive steps toward diplomatic solutions. A good first step would be an end to the Soviet and Cuban arms transfers that have militarized Central America.~~

Sixth

*** Institutionalization of political pluralism and respect for human rights. Ultimately, our hopes for a more cooperative and sustainable relationship rests on democratization ~~of~~ and institutionalization of the rule of law in the Soviet Union itself.

~~Seventh~~

~~*** Reducing threats to the security of every nation from the spread of ballistic-missile technology; nuclear, chemical and biological weapons; and terrorism.~~

Seventh

*** ~~Acceptance~~ Join with ~~the United States~~ US and ~~the world community responsibility for~~ in addressing pressing global problems, including the international drug menace, and dangers to the environment.

As the Soviet Union creates the conditions for reconciliation, ~~they~~ it will find willing partners in the West. (Let me tell you how we will respond.) WE ARE WAITING TO REACH OUT A HAND IN RESPONSE.

~~The United States seeks~~ We are stabilizing verifiable arms-control agreements with the Soviet Union and its allies. ~~We seek agreements that increase stability while reducing numerical levels of weapons~~. But arms control is not an end in itself. ~~This government~~ We seek arms-control ~~proposals that are~~ measures which are consistent with our overall ~~defense~~ Natl. Sec. strategy.

To this end, I directed Secretary Baker to propose to the Soviets that we resume negotiations on strategic forces and nuclear testing in June. I am pleased to announce that the Soviets have agreed. Strategic arms negotiations will resume in Geneva the week of June, 19; nuclear testing negotiations the following week.

Our basic approach is clear. In the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, we ~~will seek~~ wish to reduce the risk of nuclear war. In the companion Defense and Space Talks, our objective will be to preserve our options to deploy advanced defenses should they prove feasible. In nuclear testing we will continue to seek the necessary verification improvements in existing treaties ~~so that they can~~ to permit them to be brought into force. We will continue to seek a

verifiable

global ban on chemical weapons, ~~which must be effectively verified.~~ We ~~must~~ support NATO efforts to reduce the Soviet ~~armor~~ off. threat in the negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe.

~~Critical reconciliation . . . these words will provide the tenor of our negotiations.~~ We will not seek agreements for the sake of agreements. We will not compromise our basic principles. But if the Soviets take a ~~similar~~ CONSTRUCTIVE approach, we can move together to a safer, more stable world.

((Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness.

LET US

((~~We can~~ institutionalize our dedication to openness. ~~Why ask for half-measures?~~ Let all the barriers come down. ~~Open the skies, open the borders,~~ open the airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of Western books and newspapers in the Soviet Union. Let it come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West. And let it come to mean one thing more . . .

Open emigration,

open debates

(OVER)

((Simple openness must be an essential principle of this transforming relationship. It has always been the guiding principle of the democracies, and we are pleased that the Soviet Union now says it seeks a new era of openness. But we will test their dedication to openness by proposing to make each nation ever more transparent to the other.

((Thirty-four years ago, President Eisenhower met in Geneva with Soviet leaders who, after the death of Stalin, promised a new approach to relations with the West. He proposed then a plan called "Open Skies," which would allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to conduct frequent reconnaissance flights over the territory of the other country. This would open up military activities to constant scrutiny and, as Eisenhower put it, "convince the world that we are . . . lessening danger and relaxing tension."

((Eisenhower's suggestion tested Soviet readiness to open their society. The Kremlin failed that test. I now renew the proposal, but on a broader, more intrusive and radical basis.

((I invite not only the Soviet Union, but also Moscow's allies in the Warsaw Pact, and our allies in the North Atlantic Alliance, to agree to open their skies and provide needed support facilities for the frequent conduct of unarmed aerial inspection flights over their territory by planes from the other side. We

suggest that those countries that wish to accept this invitation meet soon to work out the necessary technical details.

((Such flights, in unison with satellites, would provide constant scrutiny for both sides. And such unprecedented territorial access would show the world the meaning of the Western concept of openness -- a concept as central to Western values today as it was in Eisenhower's time. THE VERY SOV. willingness to embrace such a concept would reveal much to S. concerning to fundamental different relationship.

((~~Why should we ask for half-measures?~~ Let all the barriers come down. Open the skies, ~~open the borders,~~ open the airwaves . . . Let openness come to mean the publication and sale of Western books and newspapers in the Soviet Union. Let it come to mean nothing less than the free exchange of people, books and ideas between East and West.))

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, then our economic ties will surely broaden. American investment and commerce will grow if the Soviets create a domestic environment more congenial to ~~free enterprise~~) with the USSR economic freedom.

Until now, economic relations have been hindered by Soviet internal policies. They have also been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions ~~must~~ should take place

((Let us allow unarmed aircraft from the United States and the Soviet Union to conduct frequent reconnaissance flights over the territory of the other country.))

> INSERT <

If the Soviet Union joins us in a more cooperative relationship, then our economic ties will surely broaden. American investment and commerce will grow if the Soviets create a domestic environment more congenial to free enterprise.

Until now, economic relations have been ~~hindered~~ (STIFLED) by Soviet internal policies. They have also been injured by Moscow's practice of using the cloak of commerce to steal technology from the West. Ending discriminatory treatment of U.S. firms would be a helpful step. Trade and financial transactions ~~must~~ should take place on a normal commercial basis, without subsidies. ((And ~~if~~ should the Soviet Union codifies its emigration laws in accord with international standards, implements its new laws faithfully, and ~~increases levels of emigration~~, but I am prepared to work with Congress ~~and the American people~~ on a temporary waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, ~~which would~~ give the Soviet Union ~~access to~~ Most Favored Nation status.))

AND SEEK THE REPEAL OF THE STEVENSON AMENDMENTS IN OUR TRADE REL. ing

We are at the beginning of ~~our~~ a new journey toward a better world. The day must come ~~when~~ (THE TWO HALVES OF) Europe ~~is~~ RECONCILED + united, when Europeans can drive from Moscow to the Normandy coast without seeing a single guard tower, or a single strand of barbed wire. The day

must come when the voices of all Europeans can be heard in free elections. The day must come throughout the world when the first instinct is to settle regional disputes by ~~mediation~~, not by violence.

Many quote Winston Churchill ~~on the Soviet Union~~, who called ~~it~~ "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." As perestroika and glasnost progress, we hope that these words will come to describe ~~a~~ Soviet Union of ~~a distant~~ past. But much depends on the Soviet Union and its willingness to engage our challenge. This is ~~a good time to~~ remember the rest of what Churchill said. "The key" to the Soviet Union, said Churchill, is its "national interest." We hope to convince the leadership of the Soviet Union that it is in their national interest to reconcile their system to the international community.

I recognize the extraordinarily ambitious character ~~of the~~ ~~critical reconciliation~~. ~~Today's~~ challenge is unique. We must retain the strength that has kept the world at peace for a near half-century. But we must also be bold and imaginative. We must balance risk and opportunity, ~~discretion and valor~~. To succeed, we only need the unity of the American people, a renewed bipartisan spirit and close cooperation between allies -- in short, the courage and goodwill of free peoples.

Forty-three years ago, a young Lieutenant by the name of Albert Kotzebue, a Texas A&M graduate, was the first American soldier to shake hands with the Soviets at the banks of the Elbe River. Once again, it is a time for peace. Once again, we extend our hand across the Elbe. We do this for you.

I am a man of this century. But the next century is yours, another American century in which you and your children can know a better world. Thank you for inviting me to Texas A&M, and I wish you the very best in the years to come.

# # #